DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 247 947 IR 050 829

AUTHOR Wood, Fiona
TITLE Evaluation of a University Library's Catalogue. Patron Usage, Problems and Policy Direction. ANU Library Occasional Paper No. 4.
INSTITUTION Australian National Univ., Canberra.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-86784-443-4
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 82p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Business Officer, The Library, Australian National University, P.O. Box 4, Canberra City, 2601, Australia ($8.50 per copy).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Libraries; Foreign Countries; *Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Library Catalogs; Library Instruction; *Library Materials; Library Surveys; Problems; Questionnaires; *Undergraduate Students; Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS *Australia; Australian National University; Online Catalogs

ABSTRACT

This paper presents results from a study undertaken in 1983 at the Australian National University (ANU) to determine the extent and type of problems academic staff and students had while using the library's catalogs or while locating materials on the shelves. A questionnaire mailed to a stratified random sample of approximately 1,200 academic staff, post-graduate and undergraduate students, and research assistants, yielded a response rate of between 70% and 87% for each of the target populations. Responses showed that a substantial portion of the university community had experienced some or all of the following: (1) confusion resulting from the number of different catalog sequences and the variety of formats used on microfiche and card records; (2) inadequate sign postings and floor plans; (3) insufficient reader service instruction on the range of library materials available and its location; and (4) inadequate information about changes in the catalog or relocation of particular books and journals. Information was also obtained on the desired range of access points to be made available when the catalog is put online. Tables displaying survey results and the nine-page survey questionnaire are included. (THC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED247947

ANU LIBRARY

OCCASIONAL PAPER No. 4

Evaluation of a university library's catalogue

Patron usage, problems and policy direction

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Fiona Wood

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fiona Wood

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Canberra, Australian National University, 1984

IR050829

Printed and published in Canberra at
The Australian National University 1984.

This book is copyright. Apart from any
fair dealing for the purpose of research,
private study, criticism or review, as
permitted under the Copyright Act, no
part may be reproduced by any process
without written permission.

c 1984 The Australian National University,
P.O. Box 4, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia, 2601

National Library of Australia Card No.
and ISBN 0 86784 443 4.

CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	v
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
	ABSTRACT	vii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 The Catalogue	1
2	THE ANU LIBRARY SURVEY	5
	2.1 Objectives	5
	2.2 The Library and The University	6
3	METHODOLOGY	8
	3.1 The questionnaire	8
	3.2 Sample selection	8
	3.3 Follow-ups	9
	3.4 Response rates	10
	3.5 Weighting	12
	3.6 Standard errors of estimates	12
4	RESULTS	15
	4.1 Catalogue use	15
	4.2 Instruction on the catalogue	16
	4.3 Problems with the catalogue	19
	4.4 Assistance from Library staff	23
	4.5 Catalogues consulted	25
	4.6 Information used from the catalogues	28
	4.6.1 Journals	28
	4.6.2 Books	30
	4.6.3 Audio-visual	33
	4.6.4 Other cataloguing information required	33

Page

4.7 Online catalogue search parameters 34
4.8 Information on catalogue changes 36
4.9 Satisfaction with information on catalogue use 38
4.10 Difficulties locating library material 39
4.11 Satisfaction with information on how to find library material 41
4.12 Information on movement of library material 43
4.13 Total group comparisons 46

5 CONCLUSION 51

FOOTNOTES 57

APPENDICES 60

A.1 Derivation of base numbers for calculating standard errors in this survey 61

A.2 Survey questionnaire 64

PREFACE

The present study is the fourth in the series of Occasional Papers produced by the ANU Library. The other publications in this series are as follows and are still in print -

Watson, E et al — A study of costs of the inter-library loan system at the Australian National University. February 1978. Occasional Paper No. 1.

Wood, F — Online bibliographic retrieval services in various Australian Tertiary institutions: Trends in the scope and nature of online searching and an evaluation of patron satisfaction. 1981. Occasional Paper No. 2.

Wood, F — Use and Perception of an Academic Library. A survey at the Australian National University. 1982. Occasional Paper No. 3.

Enquiries regarding their purchase should be addressed to the Business Officer - Library, R.G. Menzies Building, ANU, G.P.O. Box 4, Canberra, A.C.T., 2601.

It is only by undertaking such research projects as described in the present paper that individual institutions can both determine how their operations affect the communities they service as well as develop policies that are not based solely on management perceptions of operations or factors relating to the political dimensions of a given issue. The Library is extremely grateful to Fiona Wood, and the staff identified in her acknowledgement, for the production of this paper which will be of some interest to other libraries, given common issues of concern.

Colin Steele
University Librarian.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The generous sharing of information by Dr Neil Radford and his staff concerning the project undertaken in the Fisher Library of the University of Sydney during 1981 on reader catalogue and location difficulties is gratefully acknowledged. By having access to background details of a study already conducted the ANU Library was able to avoid possible waste of effort in determining the most appropriate research design for its proposed investigation.

I would also like to express my appreciation to Dr Roger Jones (Research School of Social Sciences) for his assistance and advice in the sample design and selection and for his many valuable comments on the direction of the study. Roger also compiled the information regarding standard errors for Appendix 1

Bev Payne and Veronica Bullock were enthusiastic members of the project team and demonstrated great care in preparing the raw data for analysis and in many other activities associated with the study. Michelle Spoljar typed the final report and is to be commended for her speed, accuracy and good cheer. Thanks is also due to Margaret Gillespie who typed the many tables that appear throughout the report. A number of Library staff, (in particular, Colin Steele and other members of the Policy and Planning Committee) provided comment and support throughout the study and for this I am most grateful.

Finally, the University community showed its concern for the issues surveyed by responding so fully to the questionnaire. As a result, the Library now has access to a wealth of information which will allow it to more satisfactorily support patrons in their use of the collections.

Fiona Wood
(Research and Development Officer).

ABSTRACT

During 1983, academic staff and students at the Australian National University were surveyed to determine the extent and type of problems they had experienced in either using the Library's catalogues or in finding material at the shelves. Information was also obtained on the range of access points which should be made available when the Library's online catalogue becomes operational.

The responses received showed that a substantial proportion of the University community had experienced problems at some time in accessing the Library's collections. These problems were unrelated to the length of time a respondent had been at this University and, in the case of students, their part-time or full-time status. It was also apparent that a number of academics and students were not aware that efficient use of the catalogue normally requires consulting several fiche sequences in addition to the card version. Other problems included the variety of formats used on fiche and card records; inadequate signposting and floor plans; insufficient instruction on the range of material available or its location; inadequate information about changes to the catalogues or movement of particular books and journals; and the absence of one unified catalogue in all Library locations.

The science or non-science affiliation of academics and post-graduates and the enrolment by Faculty of undergraduates, were found to interact with a number of key variables in the survey. In particular, whether or not staff help was obtained when a problem was experienced, how the respondent kept up-to-date with changes to the Library's operations and the type of bibliographic details used from the catalogues. The important role of reader services staff in helping patrons use the collection was a further major result of the survey.

In relation to the proposed online catalogue, the main demand from respondents was for access by 'Subject', 'Title' and 'Area' in addition to the 'Author' keyword access which would automatically be provided.

One of the central implications of the survey is that if staff and students are not to be frustrated in obtaining the information or material they want from the Library, reader services should be examined in terms of the appropriateness of its structure; the professional skills of its staff and the adequacy of the resources allocated for its operations. On a more fundamental level, however, the survey findings question the appropriateness of past and proposed Library policy and operations in relation to the catalogue. In particular, the findings caution against formulating policies which require frequent changes to the catalogue and which are based primarily on bibliographic control considerations. Patron needs and convenience of access must be given priority in any information system design, if that system is to function as it was intended.

1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE CATALOGUE

Few other library facilities have caused such continued concern to administrators in academic institutions as the catalogue. The history of this concern is nowhere more apparent than in the professional literature where a great deal of attention has been directed to examining such issues as the increasing complexity of the catalogue; the amount of resources which have to be committed to its upkeep and to patron support; the role of international standards in relation to local requirements; and the nature and extent of patron frustration in using this facility to check library holdings or to find an item on the shelves. Although the catalogue has been provided in varying formats (card, fiche and computer), user acceptablility has been variable and has highlightened the lack of resolution of how best to "... maintain the catalog system as the dynamic finding tool it is meant to be."[1]

Many of the problems associated with the catalogue are a direct result of attempts to make it serve as both a finding tool for library patrons and a source of bibliographic control for librarians.[2] The competing demands from these two functions have inevitably led to compromise in catalogue organisation with patron information needs and searching habits frequently taking second place to bibliographic considerations. As a result, catalogue design has tended to be based on a de facto assumption that the patron can be moulded to fit the system.[3] Thus rather than being provided with a simple and efficient means of accessing the collection, patrons have been continuously confronted by complex systems in which they are expected to understand numerous rules and standards; adapt to changes in physical formats; cope with a multiplicity of catalogues in the one library location; and keep up with any changes that may occur in local cataloguing procedures.[4] The costs of such design faults are evident in the frustration experienced by library patrons and the increasing

resources which have to be diverted from other operations, particularly in reader services, to help users understand the structure and organisation of the catalogue.[5]

While improvements have been made to the catalogue, these have tended to be of a "cosmetic rather than substantive" nature, with few attempts to improve the bibliographic or subject access for the patron.[6] This is despite the existence for some years of extensive information about the behaviour of catalogue users and possible reasons for non-use, that clearly calls into question the adequacy of tradional library operations and policy in this area.[7] The importance of designing catalogue systems around patron requirements is well illustrated in the statement by Line that:

> "As ordinary human beings, users will take the shortest road they know of, use the least effort possible, resent it if they think their time is being wasted, be unprepared to learn difficult or complex or inconvenient systems, and use systems only if they are rewarded for doing so or penalized for not doing so."[8]

By relying on the assumption that all user requirements for the catalogue are the same, administrators have avoided coming to terms with the problem of how best to cater for the "diverse and widespread" demand of patrons.[9] However, even if administrators wanted to alter the design of catalogues to more adequately reflect the differing information needs of patrons, they are potentially constrained by the limited influence individual libraries have over international standards.[10]

The problems caused for patrons by the operations of the traditional card and fiche catalogues have been extensively investigated by a number of researchers. These studies in general focus on the extent and cause of user "failure" to obtain information about a known item in the catalogue or to find material at the shelves. Apart from identifying actual catalogue deficiencies, such studies also allow the administrator to determine the adequacy of library holdings in relation to patron demands. A review of the major research carried

out until the mid-1970s is provided by Lancaster.[11] An example of a more recent study carried out in Australia is the examination of user "failure" within the main library of the University of Sydney.[12] Data were collected over a year providing the basis for a comprehensive analysis of reader problems. Just under 3,000 people were interviewed during the survey at the catalogue and at the shelves. The failure rate for finding an item at the shelves was greater than the rate for finding information on a known item in the catalogue. The results of the study strongly criticise the performance of the catalogues in supporting the University's "teaching, learning and research functions." The author argues that in view of both the substantial financial commitment made to university libraries and the importance of ensuring that patrons are not denied efficient access to the collections, the catalogue must be made more reliable both in terms of content and structure. Such action is vital if libraries are to maintain their credibility as information providers. Like other researchers in the field, the author of the University of Sydney study sees the introduction of online public access catalogues (OPACs) as holding the solution to many of the problems that have been posed by the card and fiche versions. However, the success with which bibliographic and patron requirements can be reconciled is still to be established. A useful coverage of a number of the main issues raised by OPACs, particularly in relation to reader services and cataloguing operations, is provided in the December 1983 issue of Cataloguing Australia.[13]

One of the most important features of OPACs is that the current technology allows their design to be compatible with patron requirements and searching habits.[14] In this context the studies funded by the Council on Library Resources concerning such issues as the "discrepancies such systems offer and what the library patron really seems to want" will be of great value to the library community in general as well as to specific institutions which have not as yet introduced these systems.[15] The importance of obtaining qualitative information regarding user and non-user needs and perceptions of OPACs should be heeded by all librarians concerned with patron acceptability of the online catalogue.[16]

Although OPACs are being promoted in terms of their obvious benefits in improving the bibliographic and subject access provided to patrons, these benefits may not eventuate if librarians do not resolve some of the fundamental design problems which have characterised the card and fiche versions. Beckman warns that "OPACs will just be removing the information problems users have to another level if they do not come to terms with restrictions of traditional cataloguing practices and philosophies."[17] In this context it is interesting to note that Line and Grose made a similar demand for a "fundamental questioning of all cataloguing principles and practice" over fifteen years ago, suggesting perhaps that some basic questions about the organisation and direction of librarianship also need to be answered.[18]

Innovation in academic libraries has not been one of the more obvious features of past operations. Yet a willingness to innovate is essential if these libraries are to go beyond making merely superficial improvements to the catalogue.[19] This raises the inevitable question of "whether librarians, and this includes cataloguers, will be able to adapt to new situations and make use of their expertise to exploit new techniques."[20] On a positive note it is clear that computerisation has allowed the responsibility for complex, routine work associated with catalogue maintenance to be shifted from professional to support staff. Professional staff, as a result, are in a position to focus their efforts towards supporting reader services activities in particular and client-based operations in general.[21] The answer to the above question is not therefore connected with whether librarians have the opportunity to respond to change but rather whether they have the willingness.

2

THE ANU LIBRARY SURVEY

2.1 OBJECTIVES

The report presented below concerns a study undertaken at the Australian National University (ANU) during 1983 to determine the extent and type of problems academic staff and students had experienced in either using the Library's catalogues or finding material at the shelves. The study was prompted by the numerous changes that had occurred within Library operations in recent years, notably - the use of both card and fiche formats for the catalogue; the introduction of the 2nd edition Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules; the implementation of Recommendation 3.3 of a recent University review of the Library "that the placement of material within the main buildings and locations of the Library system should be rationalized"[22]; and the acceptance of tenders for a computer system to support the Library's proposed online public access catalogue. While it was considered that some of these changes would have caused initial problems for Library patrons, their actual impact was never documented thus limiting the possible success of policy formulation in relation to reader support activities and catalogue construction. Like the study conducted by Lipetz at Yale University, attempts were made during the ANU survey to obtain information about patron bibliographic requirements that could be incorporated in the design of the Library's online catalogue.[23] Attention was also directed to identifying possible ways that the current card and fiche versions could be improved while they were still in operation.

The target populations for the survey were full-time members of academic staff (including visiting Fellows); all postgraduate students; all undergraduate students (except for non-degree non-enrolments); and research assistants. As catalogue traffic use data were not available at the time of the study, specific instances of catalogue use were not examined. However, the results show that this did not limit the usefulness of the investigation in providing the detail necessary for policy formulation and revision.

2.2 THE LIBRARY AND THE UNIVERSITY

The ANU Library is a decentralized system housed in three main buildings and seven specialized branch libraries. The Library's collection contains approximately 1.2 million items and during 1983 the number of orders placed and volumes accessioned was just over 60,000 items for both Western and Asian language material. This places it approximately on the same level in holdings as the University libraries of Queensland, Melbourne, Adelaide, Monash and New South Wales. During 1983 the total student body numbered just under 5,000 undergraduates and approximately 1,300 postgraduates. Academic staff totalled about 1,000 and research assistants almost 200. The University is unique in Australia in that it is divided into two principal parts - the Institute of Advanced Studies and The Faculties. The Institute has seven large Research Schools - Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Earth Sciences, the John Curtin School of Medical Research, Pacific Studies, Physical Sciences and Social Sciences. The Institute does not have any undergraduate studies but is concerned solely with supporting the research efforts of its staff and postgraduate students. The prominence of the Schools in research on both international and local levels has resulted in a relatively high proportion of visiting academics compared with other Australian universities. This, combined with the number of research assistants employed by the Schools, makes the Library's role in supporting the research functions of its academics slightly more complex than is usual for most other tertiary institutions. In contrast to the Schools, the Faculties have both undergraduate and postgraduate enrolments. Facilities are also provided for research. The Faculties incorporates Arts, Asian Studies, Economics and Commerce, Law and Science. There are also a number of multidisciplinary research centres on campus.

Since the ANU was established, the Library's catalogue has undergone many changes. For example, there is not one sequence of catalogue but ten; items can be accessed on both card and microfiche; not all Library locations list the holdings of all the collections

in their catalogues; and revisions to international standards have resulted in current material being entered in the catalogue in a different way from earlier holdings. Relocation of some material on campus because of space problems and collection rationalisation has also increased the complexity of the catalogue as it has not always been possible to indicate these changes as they have occurred, with reliance being placed primarily on information sheets and signs.

Given the descriptions provided above concerning the ANU and the Library, some of the problems identified in the survey were, of course, of no surprise. It is therefore recommended that these outlines be used as a context for interpreting the study results.

3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The respondents were surveyed using a seven page questionnaire comprising both fixed choice and open ended items. The form was divided into four major areas of inquiry:

1. basic sociodemographic information;
2. use of and problems with the catalogue;
3. information needed from both the current manual and the proposed online catalogues;
4. problems locating library material.

The questionnaire was mailed to all respondents at their departmental or home addresses in July 1983. Three weeks was allowed for its completion. A covering letter was enclosed with the questionnaire which explained why the survey was being conducted, how the respondent came to be selected and which also stressed the importance of the respondent's co-operation in completing the form.

3.2 SAMPLE SELECTION

Statistical information and address lists concerning the four groups to be surveyed were obtained from the University's Statistical Office and from Student Administration.

Due to differences in the use of library material between those in the social sciences and humanities and those in the physical and natural sciences, both academic staff and postgraduate students were stratified on this characteristic for comparison purposes. The simplest way of forming these strata was by using the School/Faculty information provided in the above lists. There were four strata within each group.

Within each of the resulting eight strata and the research assistant's group, a systematic random sampling procedure was used with the integer skip interval chosen to give a sample size of about seventy persons per strata.

Undergraduate students were stratified into four strata by Faculty. It was considered that the information resulting from this stratification could be more meaningfully used when trying to relate particular problems to specific Library collections. The resulting strata were: Asian Studies, Law, Science and Arts/Economics.

Again a systematic random sample was used with the integer skip interval chosen to give a sample size of about one hundred and forty persons per strata.

3.3 FOLLOW-UPS

A reminder letter and additional questionnaire were sent out to all respondents who had failed to reply by the set date. This second mail out was successful in eliciting a satisfactory response rate from academic staff and research assistants. Non-respondents still remaining from the other two samples were contacted by phone and reminded of the survey. This was a very useful way of establishing whether in fact the respondent was still at the University and also of achieving the required response level.

3.4 RESPONSE RATES

The details concerning sample selection and the resulting response rates are provided below in Tables 1 to 4.

TABLE 1: Academic Staff

	Population*	Sample**	Returns	Response Rate %
IAS Science (RSBS, RSC, JCSMR, RSES, RSPHYSS, CRES)	390	72	56	78
IAS Social Science (RSSS, RSPACS, HRC, HRP, DSC Japan/Aust Research Program)	220	56	48	86
Faculty Science	127	64	52	81
Faculty Other (Arts, Economics, Law, Asian Studies)	250	72	53	74
TOTAL	987	264	209	79%

* As at 30 April 1983

** Excludes inactives.
(Those selected in the sample who could not be located at the address provided by University records or who were not in Canberra during the survey.)

TABLE 2: Postgraduate students

	Population*	Sample**	Returns	Response Rate %
IAS Science (RSBS, RSC, JCSMR, RSES, RSPHYSS, CRES)	236	73	60	82
IAS Social Science (RSPACS, RSSS, HRC, HRP, SPRU, DSC)	190	59	42	71
Faculty, Science	226	65	54	83
Faculty Other (Arts, Economics, Law, Asian Studies - including centres - CRFFR)	667	57	39	68
TOTAL	1319	254	195	77%

* As at 30 April 1983

** Excludes inactives.
(Those selected in the sample who had completed their degree; who were no longer enrolled; who were undertaking field work either outside Canberra or Australia or who could not be located at the address provided by University records.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3: Undergraduate Students*

Faculties	Population	Sample**	Returns	Response Rate %
Arts and Economics (BEC, BAS/BEC, BEC/BSC, BEC/SCF, BA)	2502	122	77	63
Asian Studies (BA/AS, BAS/LLS)	210	100	74	74
Law (BA/LLB, LLB, BEC/LLB, LLB(G), BSC/LLB)	653	153	110	72
Science (BSC(F), BSC)	1122	135	98	73
TOTAL	4485	510	359	70%

* As at 21 July 1983 excluding non degree non enrolment

** Excludes inactives.
(Those selected in the sample who were no longer enrolled or who could not be located at the address provided by University records.)

TABLE 4: Research Assistants*

No strata

	Population	Sample**	Returns	Response Rate %
Full time and Part time	173	78	68	87%

* As at 19 April 1983

** Excludes inactives.
(Those selected in the sample who could not be located at the address provided by University records or who were unable to answer the questionnaire because of recentness of appointment or because they had left the University.)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3.5 WEIGHTING

Disproportionate sampling in this study was used to ensure sufficient number of cases for analysis of the sub-groups and to improve the precision of the estimates relating to the science/non-science division referred to above. If the strata within each group are analysed separately or comparatively, it is not necessary to weight for this differential sampling. However, when we want to combine strata for a total population estimate of all academic staff, all postgraduates or all undergraduate students some weighting of the data is required to take account of the variation in sampling fractions and response rates between the four strata in each of these groups. Assuming that the returns obtained provide a representative sample of each stratum, each case should be weighted by:

$$N_h/n_h$$

where N_h = population size in the h'th stratum,
n_h = number of returns in the h'th stratum,
and h = 1, 2, 3, 4, indicates the appropriate stratum.

Thus, for example, an estimate of the number of undergraduate students using the Library catalogues almost daily (Question 4) is given by weighting respondents from Arts and Economics by 2502/77, from Asian Studies by 218/74, from Law by 643/110 and from Science by 1122/98 (Table 3). Weights for academic staff and for postgraduates students are obtained similarly from Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

3.6 STANDARD ERRORS OF ESTIMATES

The statistics in this report are estimates derived from a sample survey. There are two types of errors possible in an estimate based on a sample survey - sampling and non-sampling. Sampling errors occur because observations are made only on a sample, not on the

entire population. Non-sampling errors arise from a variety of sources. In particular, from non-response, definitional difficulties, differences in the interpretation of questions, inaccuracies or distortions in the information supplied by respondents, mistakes in recording or coding the data obtained and other errors of collection, processing, coverage, and estimation for missing data. The "accuracy" of a survey result is therefore determined by the joint effects of sampling and non-sampling errors.

The sample used in this survey is one of a large number of all possible samples of the same size that could have been selected using the same sample design. Estimates derived from the different samples would differ from each other. The difference between a sample estimate and the average of all possible samples is called the sampling deviation. The standard error of a survey estimate is a measure of the variation among the estimates from all possible samples, and thus is a measure of the precision with which an estimate from a particular sample approximates the average result of all possible samples.

As calculated for this report, the standard error also partially measures the effect of certain non-sampling errors, e.g. non-response, but does not measure any systematic biases in the data. Bias is the difference, averaged over all possible samples, between the estimate and the desired value.

The sample estimate and an estimate of its standard error can be used to construct interval estimates with prescribed confidence that the interval includes the average result of all possible samples (for a given sampling rate). For example, there are about two chances in three that a sample estimate will differ by less than one standard error from the figure that would have been obtained if a complete census was taken, and about nineteen chances in twenty that the difference will be less than two standard errors (95 percent confidence interval).

Almost all intervals of $\pm$ 3 standard errors from the estimate would include the average value of all possible samples.

In order to simplify the calculation of standard errors of the estimated percentages 'p' reported in the tables, the base number 'n' given in each table allows direct calculation by the formula:

$$\text{standard error} = \sqrt{p\,(1-p)/n}$$

Details of the derivation of the base numbers are given in Appendix 1.

Table 5 below can be used to determine the estimated standard error in terms of the estimated percentage 'p' and the base number. Where the sample sizes and percentages do not exactly coincide with those in Table 5, one can interpolate the confidence interval or take the closest estimate.

TABLE 5: Approximate Standard Error of Estimated Percentages

Estimated Percentage	Base of Estimated Per Cent (Cases)						
1 s.e.	230	200	150	100	75	50	30
5 or 95	1.4	1.5	1.7	2.2	2.5	3.1	4.0
10 or 90	2.0	2.1	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.2	5.5
20 or 80	2.8	2.8	3.5	4.0	4.6	5.7	7.3
25 or 75	2.9	3.1	3.8	4.3	5.0	6.1	7.9
40 or 60	3.2	3.5	4.0	4.9	5.7	6.9	8.9
50	3.3	3.5	4.1	5.0	5.8	7.1	9.1

An example is given below to illustrate the use of the above table. The survey found that 61% of academic staff had experienced problems with the catalogue. The base number for this estimate is 220 (Table 13). From Table 5, using the column 200 as the base and the row corresponding to 40 or 60 percent, the approximate standard error can be defined as 3.5. Using the 95 percent confidence level, the chances are about 19 out of 20 that the difference between the estimate of 61% and the estimate which would have resulted if the entire academic community had been surveyed using the same procedures, is less than 7 percent (or twice the standard error). In other words, the odds are about 95 out of 100 that the population value is 61 percent ± 7 percent, or lies in the range 54 to 68 percent.

4

RESULTS

The findings of the survey are detailed below. Where relevant, comparisons between strata on selected variables are made and the chi square method used to determine significance. Non-response for each item of the questionnaire was negligible but accounts for the differences between the table totals in this section and those provided in Appendix 1 as the base for calculating the standard error.

4.1 CATALOGUE USE

The frequency of catalogue use for each target group is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6: Frequency of catalogue use

	Academics	BAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Catalogue use				
Almost daily	12.3	22.4	4.7	13.3
At least once a week	40.8	28.4	50.8	40.7
At least once a month	31.3	30.8	28.1	22.2
I seldom use the catalogue	15.5	10.4	16.6	23.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(228)	(67)	(135)	(213)

Students enrolled in the Faculties of Asian Studies and Arts/ Economics tend to be more frequent users of the catalogues than those enrolled in Law and Science.

Over a third of students in the last two Faculties seldom consult the catalogues (Table 7).

TABLE 7: Catalogue usage - undergraduates

	FACULTY			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Econ
	%	%	%	%
Catalogue use				
Almost daily	20.3	9.3	8.1	16.9
At least once a week	47.3	52.7	35.7	45.5
At least once a month	13.5	30.9	21.4	22.0
I seldom use the catalogue	18.9	35.2	36.7	15.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(74)	(108)	(98)	(77)
χ^2 = 29.06 p = 0.001				

Frequency of catalogue use was not significantly different between strata for either postgraduates or academics.

4.2 INSTRUCTION ON THE CATALOGUE

Although there are a number of library sources for obtaining information on the catalogues, Table 8 shows that a large minority of staff and students either did not use them or were unaware of their availability.

TABLE 8: Ever had an explanation on catalogue use?

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	67.9	82.1	80.7	79.5
No	32.1	17.9	19.3	20.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(226)	(67)	(135)	(213)

While most postgraduates had seen an explanation on catalogue use, the proportion was noticeably lower for IAS science students than those in the other strata (Table 9). However, strata has no overall effect on whether or not an explanation had been received by undergraduates or academics.

TABLE 9: Catalogue explanation - postgraduates.

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Yes	67.8	92.9	79.6	82.1
No	32.3	7.1	20.4	17.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(59)	(42)	(1**)	(39)
χ^2 = 9.67 p = 0.**				

For those who had received an explanation on catalogue use (Table 10), this came primarily from Library staff. Printed guides or information sheets were used by about half of the postgraduates, but by slightly less staff and undergraduates. A minority of postgraduates also asked their colleagues for catalogue information.

TABLE 10: Source of explanation

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Library staff				
Yes	70.8	70.9	69.0	75.6
No	29.2	29.1	31.0	24.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(153)	(55)	(107)	(168)
Guide/Info sheet				
Yes	42.8	38.2	51.1	37.8
No	57.2	61.8	48.9	62.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(153)	(55)	(107)	(167)
Colleagues				
Yes	7.5	10.9	15.5	7.3
No	92.5	89.1	84.5	92.7
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(153)	(55)	(107)	(168)

Non-science academics and postgraduates used information sheets more than their counterparts in the science strata (Table 11). The minority of postgraduates consulting their colleages on the catalogues tended to come from the Research Schools.

TABLE 11: Source of explanation - academics and postgraduates

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Guide/info sheet				
Academics				
Yes	30.6	62.5	34.4	47.4
No	69.4	37.5	65.6	52.6
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(36)	(32)	(32)	(38)
χ^2 = 8.47 p = 0.037				
Postgraduates				
Yes	32.0	46.0	33.0	64.0
No	68.0	54.0	67.0	36.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(40)	(39)	(43)	(31)
χ^2 = 9.73 p = 0.02				
Colleague				
Postgraduates				
Yes	25.0	30.8	9.3	9.7
No	75.0	69.2	90.7	90.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(40)	(39)	(43)	(31)
χ^2 = 8.84 p = 0.03				

Most respondents were satisfied with the catalogue explanations they received (Table 12).

TABLE 12: Was this information adequate?

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	92.9	87.0	82.4	84.0
No	7.1	13.0	17.6	16.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(154)	(54)	(110)	(171)

However, a number of specific criticisms were made which should be of assistance in preparing future reader education programs and orientation courses for Library staff. These include inadequate explanations from Library staff (either on an individual or group level) because of information overload, insufficient information on the range of material available (e.g. pamphlets, folios and indexes), and part-time staff not being familiar enough with the operations of the Library system. General catalogue deficiencies were also cited such as there being too many catalogues to search and inadequate entries for journals. A small number of respondents also indicated that the information they had received on the catalogues was inadequate because they lacked sufficient confidence to approach Library staff for additional explanations. Some examples of the comments made by staff and students are provided below.

- *Because the catalogue itself is deficient. Most important it is split and some collections are split, so you are NEVER SURE that every possible option has been explored.*
- *If a cataloguing system isn't so simple as to need no explanation (except for technical information on how to use the microfiche reader) there is something wrong with it.*
- *I find I am learning more by trial and error: the explanation left me a little lost.*
- *Because the library tours were on at the very beginning of the year when we had not yet had to use the catalogues and without that, the explanations were virtually useless.*

4.3 PROBLEMS WITH THE CATALOGUE

A high percentage of research assistants had experienced problems with the catalogues (76%). However, this may in part be explained by the bibliothecal nature of many research assistant positions, which requires the frequent consultation of the catalogues.

Approximately 60% of academics and students also had catalogue difficulties (Table 13), but there were no significant strata differences.

TABLE 13: Have you ever had problems with the catalogues?

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	60.9	75.8	59.4	57.5
No	39.1	24.2	40.6	42.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(220)	(66)	(133)	(114)

The division between card and microfiche and knowing which catalogue to look in or what to look under appear to be the main problems (Table 14).

TABLE 14: Main catalogue problems

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Card/fiche				
Yes	53.3	45.1	41.1	32.0
No	46.7	54.9	58.9	68.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(133)	(51)	(76)	(124)
Where to look				
Yes	25.1	32.7	36.2	42.1
No	74.9	67.3	63.8	57.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(131)	(49)	(74)	(123)

The actual comments made on the returns give a greater insight to the frustrations felt. For example:

. *The split in the catalogue is the worst feature. The lack of a TOTAL catalogue in all locations is the next. These conditions mean I am never certain that all options have been checked; also when one option is checked, others cannot be checked without running all over campus.*

- *Sometimes the information was not in the catalogues in the place where I was (e.g. A.D. Hope Basement), sometimes the book was in the Library but the microfiche catalogue had not been updated. In addition, and most importantly, the multiplicity of catalogues (not only between card and microfiche but also with the microfiche) is the crippling burden. Time and energy are scarce resources and the multiple catalogues absorb these most grieviously. Moreover, the card catalogue has become a defective instrument. It needs continuing care and attention, in order to correct the misfiling of cards and to remove superfluous order slips.*
- *a) Sheer frustration with both microfiche and cards.*
  b) Personal inability to even master use of microfiche which I find incredibly difficult and time consuming.
- *Never confident in my attack. Experience seems to be needed. Division BETWEEN CARD and MICROFICHE confusing.*
- *I want to know about microfiche, but I'm nervous about asking. (Who's a silly bunny?)*
- *It's easy to look up a specific work, but when looking for works which might be relevant (on a "pot-luck" basis) to the topic in general I have a hunch that the catalogues aren't so hot.*
- *I didn't realise the cards were obsolete and I should look in microfiche first. Felt intimidated by microfiche having never seen one before, and prior understanding was assumed by the librarian.*

Table 15 suggests that probably more of the students with card/microfiche problems come from the Law and Arts/Economics Faculties than from Asian Studies or Science.

TABLE 15. Catalogue problems - undergraduates

	FACULTY			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Econs
	%	%	%	%
Card/fiche				
Yes	25.5	42.9	20.8	34.0
No	74.5	57.1	79.2	66.0
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(47)	(63)	(48)	(47)
$\chi^2 = 7.18$ $p = 0.06$				

For postgraduates, the responses indicate that IAS science students do not find the division between card and fiche as much a problem as those in the other strata (Table 16).

TABLE 16: Catalogue problems - postgraduates

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Card/fiche				
Yes	18.5	38.1	46.9	45.8
No	81.5	61.9	53.1	54.2
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(27)	(21)	(32)	(24)
χ^2 = 6.06 p = 0.10				

However, academics in the Science Faculty appear to find the two formats for the catalogue a more limiting factor than do other staff. Knowing where to look in the catalogues seems also to pose some problems for IAS Science staff and those in the non-science Faculties (Table 17).

TABLE 17: Catalogue problems - academics

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Card/fiche				
Yes	48.1	59.4	72.4	45.7
No	51.9	40.6	27.6	54.3
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(27)	(32)	(29)	(35)
χ^2 = 5.5 p = 0.138				
Where to look				
Yes	38.5	12.5	13.8	26.5
No	61.5	87.5	86.2	73.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(26)	(32)	(29)	(34)
χ^2 = 7.24 p = 0.06				

Other difficulties cited by respondents included inadequacies inherent in the catalogue itself such as insufficient cross-referencing and problems accessing journal information. The absence of a united catalogue in all library locations also received some comment. Understanding the information on the catalogue card did not appear to be a major problem, although some respondents noted limitations with the use of both Library of Congress and Bliss codes; the use of several symbols for the one location; and determining the form of material from symbols such as 'f' and '5'.

Complexity of cataloguing and classification rules; missing items not being flagged in the catalogue and a lack of confidence that all the necessary catalogues had been searched were mentioned by a minority of staff and students.

4.4 ASSISTANCE FROM LIBRARY STAFF

In general most users with catalogue problems sought help from Library staff (Table 18). However, it should be noted that approximately 30% of undergraduates did not pursue this course of action and for some it is apparent that the reasons were more to do with the approachability of staff than any other factors.

TABLE 18: Was assistance sought from Library staff?

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	87.5	90.0	91.8	71.9
No	12.5	10.0	8.2	28.1
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
N =	(139)	(50)	(78)	(120)

In relation to faculty, science students were less likely than other students to seek staff help if they had a problem (Table 19).

TABLE 19: Staff assistance sought be undergraduates

	FACULTY			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Econs
	%	%	%	%
Yes	85.4	76.6	60.9	73.3
No	14.6	23.4	39.1	26.7
n =	100.0% (48)	100.0% (64)	100.0% (46)	100.0% (60)
χ^2 = 7.66 p = 0.05*				

For most students and staff seeking help, Library staff were able to provide the required advice (Table 20).

TABLE 20: Was the problem solved satisfactorily?

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	85.8	87.8	80.2	86.2
No	14.2	12.2	19.8	13.8
N =	100.0% (135)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (75)	100.0% (88)

Where the query was not satisfied, this was attributed to a variety of reasons. For example, the inability of evening and weekend staff to keep up with changes in the Library system; the nature of the query; complexities inherent in the system already; stock maintenance problems and a perceived staff indifference to the users' problems. A greater proportion of undergraduates from the Law Faculty than from other strata did not have their problem satisfactorily resolved by Library staff (Table 21).

TABLE 21: Problem solved - undergrads, tes

	FACULTY			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Econs
	%	%	%	%
Yes	77.3	67.3	82.8	93.9
No	22.7	32.7	17.2	6.1
n =	100.0% (44)	100.0% (55)	100.0% (29)	100.0% (33)
χ^2 = 9.04 p = 0.028				

The following comments highlight why some users were dissatisfied with the assistance available.

- *The catalogue is so bad that even your own staff have several problems with it. It usually takes them 2-24 hours to sort out problems. I don't have that sort of time.*
- *For a teacher, with very limited time, it is much more economical to cut one's losses and abandon a search.*
- *The staff member found the particular item for me but I didn't understand how or why it was listed in such a form when others weren't etc. so I had similar problems at later dates.*
- *Although found the particular journal I was after, sometimes took a lot of hunting and don't feel I'd be much more adept finding a journal in the future. Still not sure where to look, microfiche?, card listing?? etc.*
- *Because I don't like to ask!! I like to have a sort of "How to Solve" pamphlet - "all you ever wanted to know and were afraid to ask!"*
- *Solved it for that instance, but still didn't understand how the system worked.*
- *I was discouraged and went home.*

4.5 CATALOGUES CONSULTED

Table 22 shows which catalogues were used by staff and students for their work. Given the variety of catalogues and differences in formats (fiche/card) it is important for users to recognise the information contained within each. In checking the status of an

item or finding specific bibliographic information, the user will in general need to consult both the main card catalogue and the microfiche cumulation. However, the survey showed that while most respondents used the main card catalogue, only 60% of academics and half of the students used the microfiche cumulation. This finding draws attention to one of the main difficulties in bibliographic instruction, that is breaking user dependence on the card catalogue.[24] This dependency is of course in part due to the historical and physical prominence of the card catalogue. It is probably also a result of the user in general being able to find some information, despite the mistakes made in accessing the catalogue.

TABLE 22: Catalogues used

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Main card catalogue				
Yes	90.3	92.6	95.3	88.3
No	9.7	7.4	4.7	11.8
Short Loan				
Yes	32.4	19.1	28.5	70.4
No	87.6	80.9	71.5	29.6
East Asian card catalogue				
Yes	5.9	4.4	4.9	0.5
No	94.1	95.6	95.1	99.5
U.K.				
Yes	2.1	10.3	5.3	0.9
No	97.9	89.7	94.7	99.1
On-order slips (cards)				
Yes	21.9	32.4	15.9	9.5
No	78.1	67.6	84.1	90.5
Library Store serials list				
Yes	9.4	17.6	8.1	1.6
No	90.6	82.4	91.9	98.4
Catalogue cumulation (fiche)				
Yes	61.6	82.4	55.0	52.5
No	38.4	17.6	45.0	47.5
Microfiche supplement				
Yes	43.5	75.0	57.5	44.6
No	56.5	25.0	42.5	55.4
Serials microfiche				
Yes	37.4	52.9	29.2	15.0
No	62.6	47.1	70.8	85.0
Library orders (fiche)				
Yes	25.8	42.6	17.1	4.9
No	74.2	57.4	82.9	95.1
N =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (135)	100.0% (214)

As one author argues, "... in order to find the best, most useful information one must develop a search strategy; and that entails using the card catalog not only in the right ways but at the right times."[25] Another area of concern indicated by Table 22 is that patrons tend to restrict themselves to a limited number of catalogues. This is consistent with findings on catalogue use in other overseas investigations.[26]

The least used catalogues were the East Asian card catalogue and the United Nations catalogue. While there are insufficient cell frequencies to compare the usage of the East Asian card catalogue by strata, it is interesting to note that 90% of the Asian Studies undergraduates did not use this facility. However, it should be noted that this catalogue is intensively used by a small group of researchers at the ANU, for whom its provision is known to be invaluable. The Serials microfiche did not show the use expected and those that did consult it were primarily research assistants.

About half of the non-science Faculties postgraduates used the Short Loan catalogue. This is important to note if changes to its operations are contemplated.

Non-science Faculties academic staff show far greater use of the microfiche supplement than staff in the other strata (Table 23).

TABLE 23: Catalogue use - academics

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Microfiche supplement				
Yes	58.9	56.3	55.8	81.1
No	41.1	43.8	44.2	18.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(56)	(48)	(52)	(53)
χ^2 = 9.99 p = 0.018				

The use of the different catalogues among research assistants is generally much greater than use among the other target groups. It would also seem that despite the importance of the fiche catalogues, a substantial proportion of students do not use them for their studies.

4.6 INFORMATION USED FROM THE CATALOGUES

Staff and students were asked to indicate what information, apart from author, title and call number they used from the catalogues. Traditionally catalogues have not provided for differences in the type of information and detail wanted by users and it was felt that the answers to this section of the questionnaire would be used to rectify this situation with the design of the online catalogue.

4.6.1 Journals

Table 24 relates to journals and shows that information such as 'publisher' and 'place of publication', is used more by research assistants than by any other target group. However, 'volumes held' and 'dates held' information is clearly important for all groups. Overall there appears to be little use of information regarding the 'form of material' by either staff or students.

For undergraduates there seems to be no difference between Faculties in the usage of the different types of information available.

'Volumes held' details are used by more than three-quarters of non-science Faculties postgraduates and by over half of those in the other strata (Table 25). 'Dates held' is used by the majority of non-science Faculties postgraduates but by only a minority of those in the science strata (Table 25).

About a third of academics in the non-science strata use 'date of publication' but only a handful of staff from the science areas use this information (Table 25).

TABLE 24: Journal information used from the catalogue (apart from author, title and call number)

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Publisher				
Yes	12.1	32.4	20.3	18.1
No	87.9	67.6	79.7	81.9
Place of Publication				
Yes	10.9	33.8	14.2	18.3
No	89.1	66.2	85.8	99.7
Date of Publication				
Yes	20.3	48.5	29.3	25.2
No	79.7	51.5	70.7	74.8
Volumes held				
Yes	55.1	73.5	66.7	32.8
No	44.9	26.5	33.3	67.2
Dates held				
Yes	35.4	61.8	45.4	27.1
No	64.6	38.2	54.6	72.9
Form of material (e.g. film, fiche)				
Yes	9.3	26.5	10.0	6.5
No	90.7	73.5	90.0	93.5
N =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (138)	100.0% (214)

TABLE 25: Journal information - use by strata

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Postgraduates				
Vols. held				
Yes	53.3	50.0	64.8	76.9
No	46.7	50.0	35.2	23.1
n =	100.0% (60)	100.0% (42)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (39)
X^2 = 8.05 p = 0.045				
Dates held				
Yes	23.3	23.8	38.9	61.5
No	76.7	76.2	61.1	38.5
n =	100.0% (60)	100.0% (42)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (39)
X^2 = 10.23 p = 0.0004				
Academics				
Publication date				
Yes	12.5	29.2	9.6	30.2
No	87.5	70.8	90.4	69.8
n =	100.0% (56)	100.0% (48)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (53)

There were no differences between strata regarding the use of the other journal information.

Apart from entries for change of journal title as well as its full name, there were few other categories of information that staff or students considered should be in the catalogues.

3.6.2. Books

The main information sought concerning books was the 'publisher', 'place of publication', and 'date of publication' (Table 26). The 'number of copies' details were also used by students. However, details concerning 'language', and 'illustrations', were only used by a handful of respondents. Research assistants were the only group to show any real requirement for information concerning 'form of material'.

TABLE 26: Book information

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Publisher				
Yes	33.9	47.1	35.6	29.7
No	66.1	52.9	64.4	70.3
Place of publication				
Yes	31.2	48.5	32.7	27.9
No	68.8	51.5	67.3	72.1
Date of publication				
Yes	37.8	44.1	44.8	45.7
No	61.2	55.9	55.2	54.3
Number of copies				
Yes	17.3	17.6	36.1	29.9
No	82.7	82.4	63.9	70.1
Language				
Yes	5.7	10.3	9.4	13.0
No	94.3	89.7	90.6	87.0
Illustrations				
Yes	1.9	2.9	0.3	1.7
No	98.1	97.1	99.7	98.3
Form of material (e.g. film, fiche)				
Yes	5.9	20.6	7.4	6.2
No	94.1	79.4	92.6	93.8
N =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (135)	100.0 (214)

'Place of publication' shows little use among science undergraduates compared with those in the other strata. The same pattern is shown with 'date of publication'. 'Language' information is primarily used by Asian Studies students (Table 27).

'Publisher' information was used by fewer science postgraduates than those in the non-science strata (Table 27). Only non-science Faculties students show any extensive use of either 'place of publication' details. Possibly because of strong competition from undergraduates for the same texts, non-science Faculties postgraduates use 'number of copies' information far more than those in the other strata.

The usage of items on the catalogue record by academic staff is similar to that of students - i.e. non-science strata make more use of the different information available than those in the science strata, particularly for 'publisher', 'place of publication' and 'date of publication' details (Table 27). However, given the low reliance on monographs in the science areas the above findings are not too surprising.

From the above it would appear that users' needs for monograph information are likely to be met by catalogue entries which contain only limited descriptive details. The benefits of being able to move away from a full entry catalogue are obvious both in terms of reduced staff time and in increased ease of access for users. Omission of some of the less frequently demanded information can of course be justified by its ready availability from the actual book itself. However, the removal of entries for other details, such as 'form of material', may disadvantage some groups which while numerically small, are involved in work that requires having such information readily available. Therefore any change in catalogue structure should be based on adequate consultation with different user groups as well as on library bibliographic control considerations.

TABLE 17: Book information - use by strata

	Strata			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Econs
	%	%	%	%
Undergraduates				
Place of Publication				
Yes	28.4	30.0	16.3	32.5
No	71.6	70.0	83.7	67.5
χ^2 = 7.44 p < 0.058				
Date of Publication				
Yes	43.2	41.8	31.6	53.2
No	56.8	58.2	68.4	46.8
χ^2 = 8.37 p = 0.004				
Language				
Yes	33.8	9.1	8.2	14.3
No	66.2	90.9	91.8	85.7
χ^2 = 27.05 p = 0.0001				
n =	100.0% (74)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (98)	100.0% (77)
	IAS SCI %	IAS SOC SCI %	FAC SCI %	FAC OTHER %
Postgraduates				
Publisher				
Yes	18.3	40.5	25.9	43.6
No	81.7	59.5	74.1	56.4
χ^2 = 9.88 p = 0.02				
Place of Publication				
Yes	10.0	23.8	24.1	46.2
No	90.0	76.2	75.9	53.8
χ^2 = 16.89 p = 0.0001				
Number of copies				
Yes	16.7	14.3	14.8	56.4
No	83.3	85.7	85.2	43.6
χ^2 = 29.22 p = 0.0001				
n =	100.0% (60)	100.0% (42)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (39)
Academics				
Publisher				
Yes	19.6	45.8	23.1	50.9
No	80.4	54.2	76.9	49.1
χ^2 = 17.38 p = 0.0008				
Place of Publication				
Yes	16.1	41.7	13.5	54.7
No	83.9	58.3	86.5	45.3
χ^2 = 29.74 p = 0.0001				
Date of Publication				
Yes	23.2	50.0	25.0	60.4
No	76.8	50.0	75.0	39.6
χ^2 = 22.71 p = 0.0001				
Number of copies				
Yes	17.9	6.3	13.5	28.3
No	82.1	93.2	86.5	71.7
χ^2 = 9.32 p = 0.025				
n =	100.0% (56)	100.0% (48)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (53)

4.6.3. Audio-visual

Although a minority of undergraduates used 'summary of content' information, details concerning audio-visual material were in general little used (Table 28).

TABLE 28: Audio-visual

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Technical details				
Yes	1.0	1.5	2.3	1.4
No	99.0	98.5	97.7	98.6
Duration				
Yes	1.4	2.9	4.8	8.6
No	98.6	97.1	95.2	91.4
Summary of content				
Yes	3.1	5.9	12.3	11.3
No	96.9	94.1	87.7	88.7
N =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (136)	100.0% (214)

4.6.4. Other cataloguing information required

Apart from a quarter of postgraduates, few of the respondents in the other target groups indicated any further cataloguing information that should be made available (Table 29).

TABLE 29: Other cataloguing information required

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	14.7	16.1	26.5	17.7
No	85.3	83.9	73.5	82.3
N =	100.0% (185)	100.0% (62)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (189)

The postgraduates making specific suggestions were primarily from the non-science Faculties. The main demand appeared to be for details of the location and status of all Library holdings to be entered in every catalogue; the provision of more detailed contents information such as key words, and the provision of a theses list in all libraries.

In summary it would appear that much of the descriptive catalogue information available is rarely used, the emphasis being more on "using the catalogue to see if works are in the library and to locate them."[27]

4.7 ONLINE CATALOGUE SEARCH PARAMETERS

'Subject', 'Title', and 'Area' keywords in this order are the main types of access points required by the University community for the proposed online public access catalogue (Table 30). This is consistent with the findings of a number of studies that subject searching an OPACs is quite common.[28]

In relation to undergraduates, 'language' was indicated by only a small minority of Asian Studies students (Table 31). Asian Studies students also appear to find 'Area' keyword access of more potential use than do students in the other Faculties.

Only a small number of postgraduates indicated any interest in 'country of publication' and 'language' options. 'Area' keywords appear to be of the least potential use for students in the science strata (Table 31).

Academic responses in relation to keyword access were not significantly different between strata.

TABLE 30: Access points for online catalogue

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Country of publication				
Yes	1.7	5.9	14.7	5.0
No	98.3	94.1	85.3	95.0
Language				
Yes	1.4	5.9	13.8	7.1
No	98.6	94.1	86.2	92.9
Year of publication				
Yes	7.4	19.1	38.7	16.1
No	92.6	80.9	61.3	83.9
Location on campus				
Yes	16.4	16.2	29.7	15.3
No	83.6	83.8	70.3	74.7
Title keywords				
Yes	34.4	44.1	49.2	40.4
No	65.6	55.9	50.8	59.6
Subject keywords				
Yes	60.5	70.6	64.3	69.9
No	39.5	29.4	35.7	30.1
Area keywords				
Yes	11.8	25.0	24.3	27.3
No	88.2	75.0	75.7	72.7
N =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (135)	100.0% (214)

TABLE 31: Keyword access by strata

	FACULTY			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-econs
	%	%	%	%
Undergraduates				
Language				
Yes	14.9	7.3	4.1	7.8
No	85.1	92.7	95.9	92.2
χ^2 = 8.80 p = 0.08				
Area keywords				
Yes	43.2	21.8	21.4	29.9
No	56.8	78.2	78.6	70.1
χ^2 = 12.88 p = 0.005				
n =	100.0% (74)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (98)	100.0% (77)
Postgraduates	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
Area keywords				
Yes	8.3	23.8	7.4	35.9
No	91.7	76.2	92.6	64.1
n =	100.0% (60)	100.0% (42)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (39)

4.8 INFORMATION ON CATALOGUE CHANGES

Table 32 shows the different sources used by staff and students for finding out about catalogue changes. The most noticeable method of finding out about changes is 'trial and error' - reported by about half of respondents in each target group.

TABLE 32: Sources for finding out about catalogue changes

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Guides/info sheet				
Yes	14.9	23.5	19.0	16.1
No	85.1	76.5	81.0	83.9
Library staff				
Yes	39.8	36.8	48.1	21.8
No	60.2	63.2	51.9	78.2
Colleagues				
Yes	3.8	2.9	5.2	4.7
No	96.2	97.1	94.8	95.3
Trial and error				
Yes	50.5	57.4	52.7	50.1
No	49.5	42.6	47.3	49.9
I don't				
Yes	20.3	17.6	16.7	34.7
No	79.7	82.4	83.3	65.3
N =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (135)	100.0% (214)

The proportion of undergraduates from each Faculty using the various options for keeping up-to-date with the catalogue was roughly the same. However, science undergraduates seem less likely than other students to obtain this information from Library staff (Table 33).

A third of undergraduates indicated that they did not find out about catalogue changes at all.

There was a greater reliance on Library staff by non-science postgraduates than their science counterparts for information about changes in the catalogue (Table 33). It would also appear that a greater proportion of IAS science students not finding out about these changes at all is far greater than the proportion for the other groups.

TABLE 33: Sources for finding out about catalogue changes by strata

	Strata			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Econs
	%	%	%	%
Undergraduates				
Library staff				
Yes	24.3	29.1	16.3	22.1
No	75.7	70.9	83.7	77.9
n =	100.0% (74)	100.0% (110)	100.0% (98)	100.0% (77)
χ^2 = 4.65 p = 0.18				
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Postgraduates				
Library staff				
Yes	31.7	50.0	38.9	56.4
No	68.3	50.0	61.1	43.6
χ^2 = 7.22 p = 0.06				
I don't				
Yes	33.3	14.3	13.0	12.8
No	66.7	85.7	87.0	87.2
χ^2 = 10.62 p = 0.01				
n =	100.0% (60)	100.0% (43)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (39)
Academics				
Guide/info sheet				
Yes	10.7	12.5	9.6	26.4
No	89.3	87.5	90.4	73.6
χ^2 = 7.70 p = 0.052				
Trial and error				
Yes	39.3	54.2	55.8	62.3
No	60.7	45.8	44.2	37.7
χ^2 = 6.22 p = 0.10				
n =	100.0% (56)	100.0% (48)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (53)

While information sheets were used by a minority of non-science Faculties staff, very few other staff indicated this source (Table 33). IAS science staff are less likely than other staff to use 'trial and error' to find out about catalogue changes.

4.9 SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION ON CATALOGUE USE

As a group, research assistants were the least satisfied with the Library information provided on the catalogues (Table 34). However, the remaining staff and students seem to be quite satisfied.

TABLE 34: Satisfaction with information on catalogue use

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	81.8	57.0	74.8	80.9
No	18.2	43.0	24.2	19.1
N =	100.0% (198)	100.0% (63)	100.0% (131)	100.0% (206)

Suggestions for improving catalogue support include more frequent instruction for users with emphasis on the practical side rather than on technical details. This instruction should also emphasize that the catalogues do change both in content and format. Better explanation sheets as well as more informative signs were additional suggestions. Some staff thought that it would be useful to be sent individual circulars notifying them on catalogue changes. Some of the more illustrative comments and suggestions are provided below:

- *I probably wouldn't read a library newsletter which provided this type of information - just as I generally don't keep up to date with the computer systems newsletters and leaflets. The investment in time would not be worth it.*
- *The catalogue CAN'T BE USED EFFECTIVELY. No matter how much information is supplied the system is flawed at its heart!*
- *Long term residents at ANU naturally assume what the catalogues have not changed since they last used them and therefore unless they are informed forcefully of changes will not consider the need to ask whether a change has been made until they cannot find something. This suggests that the onus of information lies on the Library. Similarly, if numerous reports of change cross a desk they will eventually be ignored. Changes should be rare; should only be done if they are significant and should be well publicised.*

- *As the "victims" are those who do not know that they do not know, a larger and more precise display of "how to do it" information, plus a clear pointer to, say, the Reference Desk, for information.*
- *Need a special pamphlet explaining what to do about Government Documents and journals. The Kalamazoo is much easier to use than the catalogue for journals.*
- *When the readers' advisers are on duty there is no problem; when there is no-one at the desk difficulties arise (especially when trying to find reference or periodical materials, as opposed to single-volume books). Personal advice is far more effective than reams of information sheets.*
- *More centralised information - to follow developments you have to be alert to reading signs in lots of different places, and collect lots of leaflets from around the place and work through them. Totally baffling to inexperienced users.*
- *A central point should be set up in each library where all catalogues are kept and clearly signposted. The signposts should include instructions for use and limitations (i.e. the domain) of the catalogues. Then someone who had never been in the library before could locate any document without having to ask for assistance.*

4.10 DIFFICULTIES LOCATING LIBRARY MATERIAL

A large majority of students and nearly half of academics and research assistants had experienced difficulties in locating library material (Table 35).

TABLE 35: Any difficulties in locating library material?

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	46.0	43.9	60.0	82.8
No	53.2	56.1	40.0	37.2
n =	100.0% (224)	100.0% (66)	100.0% (135)	100.0% (208)

The main problems were: the books had been misshelved or were not in a logical shelving sequence; the item was either being used in-house or deliberately hidden; the books had been borrowed, were not yet catalogued or were in Short Loan; or the item could not be located from its call number or the location symbols because of inadequate signposting (Table 36).

TABLE 36: Specific location problems

	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Books mis-shelved or not in logical sequence				
Yes	37.1	37.9	38.4	40.4
No	62.9	62.2	61.6	59.6
Book missing				
Yes	31.6	35.1	31.8	40.3
No	68.2	64.9	68.2	59.7
Book on loan, not yet catalogued etc.				
Yes	22.2	16.3	33.2	36.9
No	77.8 (N=122)	83.7 (N=43)	66.8 (N=85)	63.1 (N=131)
Don't know where material is - poor signposting				
Yes	23.2	18.9	13.2	24.3
No	76.8	81.1	76.8	75.7
N =	100.0% (106)	100.0% (37)	100.0% (81)	100.0% (131)

Other problems mentioned by a few respondents were the separation of folios from octavos and the splitting of collections amongst too many library locations as well as the movement of books to different libraries.

There were no significant differences between undergraduate strata in relation to locational problems. However, for postgraduates, locational problems appear to be greater among the non-science than the science strata (Table 37).

The incidence of misshelving of books (intentionally or unintentionally) seems to be a problem for all strata, but more particularly for science Faculty postgraduates (Table 37).

Non-science strata academics, especially those in the Faculties, had greater difficulties than other staff in locating material (Table 37).

TABLE 37: Location problems by strata

	Strata			
	IAS SCI	IAS SOC SCI	FAC SCI	FAC OTHER
	%	%	%	%
Postgraduates				
Problems				
Yes	44.1	64.3	48.1	69.2
No	55.9	35.7	51.9	30.8
n =	100.0% (59)	100.0% (42)	100.0% (54)	100.0% (39)
$\chi^2 = 8.50$ p = 0.036				
Books mis-shelved				
Yes	23.1	30.8	52.0	40.7
No	76.9	69.2	48.0	59.3
n =	100.0% (26)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (25)	100.0% (27)
$\chi^2 = 5.18$ p = 0.158				
Academics				
Problems				
Yes	30.9	53.2	42.0	68.6
No	69.1	46.8	58.0	31.4
n =	100.0% (55)	100.0% (47)	100.0% (50)	100.0% (51)
$\chi^2 = 16.35$ p = 0.001				

4.11 SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION ON HOW TO FIND LIBRARY MATERIAL

The survey data show that there is less satisfaction with information on the location of library material than there is with the guiding provided on how to use the catalogues (Table 38, also see Table 34).

TABLE 38: Satisfaction with guiding provided

Satisfied	Academics	RAs	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Yes	72.3	62.1	68.3	69.3
No	27.7	37.9	31.7	30.7
n =	100.0% (214)	100.0% (66)	100.0% (132)	100.0% (270)

For those who were not satisfied, the main recommendation was for better floor plans and general guidance, in particular, the provision of clearer more obvious signs showing the call numbers and subject areas covered in each section (Table 39). A number of research assistants and postgraduates suggested that location signs should be placed in the entrance of libraries, near the catalogues and also in the stack areas. Some respondents recommended that the end of each stack should indicate what periodicals were held. Examples of some of the suggestions include:

- *Put up a simple site plan close to catalogues.*
- *Suggested improvements for stacks carrying journals: all stacks carrying journals and periodicals should have a list of the journals and periodicals in the respective stack, attached on the side(s) of the stack. This will enable people to find the required publications quickly if they know the approximate location of the stack, without having to consult the list of journals and their respective stack every time.*
- *Bold plans - showing main subject and sub-subject headings bay by bay. More frequent scattering of the metal frames carrying the journal titles and call numbers.*
- *The location maps are confusing and bigger more comprehensive signs are needed than the ones placed above doorways high above our heads. Some subject information as well as call numbers could also help and save users a lot of time - particularly in recently re-organised shelving which is a bit of a shock when first encountered after years of a particular space being something else.*
- *Principally clearer labelling on the shelves - both at the end and along shelves.*
- *Visual improvement. Colour distinctions. Pleasantness. Libraries are too formally arranged - not convenient to walk around.*
- *Clearer and larger signs on shelves and on catalogue cards. An 'idiots guide to finding books' pamphlet with a map of locations.*
- *Supermarket - like signs. We don't have time to wander and browse endlessly in sequential fashion! Also, more signs on the ends of the shelves facing the person.*

TABLE 39: Suggestions for improvement

	Academics	Res	Postgrads.	Undergrads
	%	%	%	%
Floor plans/general guidance				
Yes	70.2	72.0	69.5	69.6
No	29.8	28.0	30.5	14.4
n =	100.0% (94)	100.0% (25)	100.0% (36)	100.0% (139)
Signs				
Yes	12.9	16.0	45.4	2.3
No	87.1	84.0	54.6	97.7
n =	100.0% (93)	100.0% (25)	100.0% (37)	100.0% (140)

4.12 INFORMATION ON MOVEMENT OF LIBRARY MATERIAL

Library staff are a main source for finding out about the relocation of material (Table 40).

TABLE 40: Means of finding out if an item has been moved

	Academics	Res	Postgrads.	Undergrads.
	%	%	%	%
Ask Library staff				
Yes	48.2	54.4	52.4	34.3
No	51.8	45.6	47.6	65.7
Trial and error				
Yes	37.1	35.3	35.7	36.4
No	62.9	64.7	64.3	63.6
Info sheets				
Yes	11.0	23.5	10.7	18.0
No	89.0	76.5	81.3	82.0
I don't				
Yes	19.2	14.7	18.4	27.5
No	80.8	85.3	81.6	72.5
n =	100.0% (230)	100.0% (68)	100.0% (136)	100.0% (214)

Science and Law undergraduates tend not to ask Library staff for information on the location of an item as much as students in the other Faculties (Table 41).

TABLE 41: Means of finding out if an item has been moved by strata

	Strata			
	Asian Studies	Law	Science	Arts-Ecos
	%	%	%	%
Undergraduates				
Library staff				
Yes	43.9	39.1	19.4	41.6
No	56.3	70.9	80.6	58.4
χ^2 = 10.11 p = 0.002				
I don't				
Yes	17.8	38.2	29.6	24.7
No	82.4	61.8	70.4	75.3
χ^2 = 9.96 p = 0.02				
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(74)	(110)	(98)	(77)
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Postgraduates				
Guide/info sheet				
Yes	6.7	9.5	18.8	25.6
No	93.3	90.5	81.5	74.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(60)	(42)	(96)	(39)
χ^2 = 8.48 p = 0.037				
Academics				
Library staff				
Yes	53.6	58.3	38.5	35.8
No	46.4	41.7	61.5	64.2
χ^2 = 7.59 p = 0.055				
Trial and error				
Yes	28.6	37.5	57.7	39.6
No	71.4	62.5	42.3	60.4
χ^2 = 9.86 p = 0.02				
Guide/info sheet				
Yes	1.8	10.5	13.5	22.6
No	98.2	89.5	86.5	77.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
n =	(56)	(48)	(52)	(53)

Academics in the Research Schools are more likely than those in the Faculties to establish the location status of a book from Library Staff.

'Trial and error' is used by a large minority of staff and students in finding material that has moved. Of those academic staff using this method far more tend to come from the Science Faculty than the other three strata.

Table 40 also shows that about a third of undergraduates do not find out about the movement of Library material. These students also tended to be from the Law Faculty (Table 41).

Information sheets, which are frequently updated by the Library, were little used as a source of information on book movement. Of those postgraduates using information sheets, a greater proportion were from the Faculties than from the Research Schools.

There is virtually no use of information sheets for establishing book movement by IAS science academics. It should be noted, however, that these staff have not generally been effected by the relocation of material to the same extent as those in the other strata.

Many respondents took the opportunity to make both specific comments about their own situation vis à vis the Library and to provide suggestions to improve Library operations. These comments indicated in particular the seriousness with which respondents viewed their ability to access the Library's collections and their frustration that the difficulties experienced in this activity were not immediately obvious to Library staff.

- *It gets harder to find things every year. Library Management should be wary of introducing "new systems", however logical they may seem, they're another wrinkle for the poor user to learn.*

- *I have no-one to blame but myself! Too many years with looking around the Public Libraries, where I seem to be able to find everything so easily. What about a roving "Can I help you person"? You surely can recognise the 'poor strugglers'! Like 'Mr Humphries' there must be times when 'are you free' - we need a 'Captain Peacock'.*

4.13 TOTAL GROUP COMPARISONS

For all target groups, the survey data show that those respondents who had catalogue problems also tended to have difficulties locating Library material (Table 42).

TABLE 42: Cross-tabulation of catalogue and location problems

	Location difficulties		
	Yes	No	Total
Catalogue problems			
Academics			
Yes	57.0	43.0	100.0% (n=130)
No	33.0	67.0	100.0% (n= 86)
X^2 = 10.88 p = 0.001			
Research Assistants			
Yes	65.0%	35.0	100.0% (n= 49)
No	25.0%	75.0	100.0% (n= 16)
X^2 = 6.38 p = 0.001			
Postgraduates			
Yes	76.0%	24.0	100.0% (n= 79)
No	38.0%	62.0	100.0% (n= 54)
X^2 = 6.38 p = 0.01			
Undergraduates			
Yes	75.0%	25.0	100.0% (n=119)
No	46.0%	54.0	100.0% (n= 89)
X^2 = 17.19 p = 0.0001			

However, there is little difference between part-time and full-time status students in terms of the proportion having either of the above problems (Table 43).

TABLE 43: Problems and student status

	Catalogue problems			Location difficulties		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Postgraduates						
Full time	62.0%	38.0	100.0%(n= 89)	62.0%	38.0	100.0%(n= 91)
Part time	55.0%	45.0	100.0%(n= 44)	57.0%	43.0	100.0%(n= 44)
	X^2 = 0.24	p = 0.61		X^2 = 0.21	p = 0.64	
Undergraduates						
Full time	58.0%	42.0	100.0%(n=145)	65.0%	35.0	100.0%(n=141)
Part time	57.0%	43.0	100.0%(n= 69)	59.0%	41.0	100.0%(n= 67)
	X^2 = 0.003	p = 0.95		X^2 = 0.379	p = 0.538	

The number of years a respondent had been at ANU was examined in relation to both catalogue and location problems. It was anticipated that those who had been at ANU two years or more would in general be more familiar with the Library system and therefore possibly less likely to experience difficulties than those who had been at the University for a shorter period. However, none of the target groups showed any significant differences in the proportion of respondents experiencing problems in relation to length of time at ANU (Table 44).

TABLE 44: Problems and length of time at ANU

	Catalogue problems			Location difficulties		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Years at ANU						
Academics						
<2	51.0%	49.0	100.0%(n= 21)	31.0%	69.0	100.0%(n= 21)
2+	62.0%	38.0	100.0%(n=199)	48.0%	52.0	100.0%(n=202)
	X^2 = 0.51 p = 0.47			X^2 = 1.73 p = 0.18		
Research Assistants	Insufficient cell frequencies			Insufficient cell frequencies		
Postgraduates						
<2	51.0%	49.0	100.0%(n= 41)	59.0%	41.0	100.0%(n= 41)
2+	63.0%	37.0	100.0%(n= 93)	61.0%	39.0	100.0%(n= 94)
	X^2 = 1.14 p = 0.28			X^2 = 0.00 p = 1.00		
Undergraduates						
<2	50.0%	50.0	100.0%(n= 58)	55.0%	45.0	100.0%(n= 58)
2+	61.0%	39.0	100.0%(n=155)	66.0%	34.0	100.0%(n=149)
	X^2 = 1.65 p = 0.19			X^2 = 1.56 p = 0.21		

When catalogue and locational problems were compared with the frequency of use of the catalogues, significant differences were found for academics on the second problem and for undergraduates on both (Table 45). Essentially, the more frequently the catalogues are used, the more problems that tend to be experienced either with the catalogue itself or in trying to find the item on the shelves. This suggests that competence in use does not develop with the extent of contact academics or undergraduates have with the catalogue.

This finding is consistent with the known complexity and flaws of the Library's catalogues.

TABLE 45: Problems in relation to frequency of catalogue use

Catalogue use	Catalogue problems			Location difficulties		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Academics						
Almost daily	54.0%	46.0	100.0%(n= 28)	46.0%	54.0	100.0%(n= 28)
At least once a week	69.0%	31.0	100.0%(n= 89)	59.0%	41.0	100.0%(n= 90)
At least once a month	59.0%	41.0	100.0%(n= 72)	39.0%	61.0	100.0%(n= 70)
Seldom use	49.0%	51.0	100.0%(n= 31)	28.0%	72.0	100.0%(n= 34)
	χ^2 = 4.74		p = 0.19	χ^2 = 11.88		p = 0.008
Undergraduates						
Almost daily	69.0%	31.0	100.0%(n= 29)	77.0%	23.0	100.0%(n= 26)
At least once a week	64.0%	36.0	100.0%(n= 87)	69.0%	31.0	100.0%(n= 85)
At least once a month	55.0%	45.0	100.0%(n= 47)	58.0%	42.0	100.0%(n= 47)
Seldom use	42.0%	58.0	100.0%(n= 50)	48.0%	52.0	100.0%(n= 47)
	χ^2 = 7.98		p = 0.04	χ^2 = 8.60		p = 0.03

The survey data suggest that about half of the students who used the 'trial and error' method also had locational difficulties (Table 46).

TABLE 46: Location difficulties and use of 'trial and error'.

Location difficulties	Use of 'trial and error'		
	Yes	No	Total
Postgraduates			
Yes	50.0%	50.0	100.0%(n= 81)
No	24.2%	75.8	100.0%(n= 53)
χ^2 = 7.84 p = 0.005			
Undergraduates			
Yes	44.8%	55.2	100.0%(n=131)
No	23.7%	76.3	100.0%(n= 78)
χ^2 = 8.46 p = 0.003			

Three quarters of academic staff with a catalogue problem had at some stage received an explanation on catalogue use (Table 47). However, from some of the comments made by these staff, it would seem that this explanation was outdated and therefore somewhat inadequate in dealing with all the changes that have occurred with the catalogues in recent years.

TABLE 47: Catalogue problems and explanation on use

Problems	Received an explanation on catalogue use		
	Yes	No	Total
Academics			
Yes	74.0%	26.0	100.0%(n=134)
No	57.7%	42.3	100.0%(n= 85)
X^2 = 5.60 p = 0.02			

The majority of academics with locational difficulties also did not use an information sheet to find out if Library material had been moved (Table 48).

TABLE 48: Location difficulties and use of information sheet

Problems	Information sheet used		
	Yes	No	Total
Academics			
Yes	16.2%	83.8	100.0%(n=105)
No	6.9%	93.1	100.0%(n=119)
X^2 = 4.01 p = 0.045			

It should also be noted that most of the academics and postgraduates who used the fiche cumulation also indicated that they had had catalogue problems (Table 49).

TABLE 49: Catalogue problems and use of fiche cumulation

Problems	Yes	No	Total
Academics			
Yes	71.9%	28.1	100.0%(n=134)
No	50.8%	49.2	100.0%(n= 86)
χ^2= 9.16 p = 0.002			
Postgraduates			
Yes	63.4%	36.6	100.0%(n= 79)
No	43.7%	56.3	100.0%(n= 54)
χ^2= 4.28 p = 0.038			

5
CONCLUSION

A large minority of staff and students have not had or seen an explanation of the Library's catalogues. As successful use of the catalogues is dependent on knowing which ones to use; what information is contained within each and how it is presented in terms of access points etc, this finding is of some concern. Changes to the structure and form of the catalogues will continue to occur, at least until the automated version is operational. In view of this, it is vital that users receive the appropriate reader education support in this area. From the survey it is clear that Library staff play an important role in not only providing explanations on how to use the catalogues (on a group or individual basis), but also in assisting users to resolve any problems they may have in locating the information they want. However, the survey also shows that more staff training is required to ensure that staff, particularly those employed on a casual basis, are familiar enough with the Library system as a whole rather than just the operations of the building they work in.

Printed guides or information sheets which the Library has traditionally spent much effort in providing were used by about half, or less than half, of staff and students. Noticeably fewer science than non-science postgraduates and academics used this source, raising some questions about the most effective ways of keeping the science areas of the University informed about catalogue changes.

Specific criticisms of the staff assistance provided for resolving catalogue problems were noted in the 'RESULTS' section. These criticisms are a reflection in part of the differing needs of particular sections of the University. However, they also indicate the influence of individual perceptions and information needs in determining the adequacy of staff assistance. In this context the Library should aim to be seen to be responsive on both the level where the problem is a product of an individual's specific work requirements, and on the wider level where the problems characterise the information needs of broad groupings within the University.

The majority of respondents had problems at some time with the catalogues (over three quarters of research assistants and about 60% of the other target groups). While it is difficult to make judgements about the seriousness of these proportions, it is hard not to conclude that the catalogues in their current form are a major limiting factor in the attempts by staff and students to obtain the bibliographic information they require.

For those respondents who had catalogue problems, the main difficulties were the division between card and microfiche and knowing which catalogues to look in or what to look under. While librarians may understand the differences between AACRI and AACRII, the logic behind a change from one set of cataloguing rules to another or the use of a variety of classification codes for different parts of the collection is probably not apparent to most users. The actual problems with the structure of the catalogues emphasize the difficulty in providing bibliographic information in a format that is satisfactory to both library users and librarians. From the current study it would seem that the catalogues have been more a tool for the cataloguers than for library users.

While most users with a catalogue problem will seek help from Library staff, science students were less likely than other students to ask for assistance. This may be because the catalogue problems encountered by science students are normally of a nature that allows the student to resolve them. Alternatively, science students may be reluctant to ask for staff assistance. This is an area which will probably require further examination.

The results concerning which catalogues staff and students use indicate fairly strongly that many users are unaware of the importance of the fiche. Some catalogues, such as those covering United Nation's material were little used. However, it is quite possible that this low use is more a result of lack of awareness of these facilities than a lack of need. In considering the use of the different catalogues it is difficult not to conclude that users do not realise that the card catalogues do not contain all information regarding the Library's holdings.

Moreover, with additional fiche sequences on 'serials' and 'on orders' material it is apparent that users are unaware of the full range of bibliographic information available. The online catalogue should overcome some of these problems but until it is operational reader education support for users of the current card and fiche versions should be readily available. This of course has implications for the level of staffing at these service points as well as the professional background of the reference librarians.

With the exception of research assistants, the majority of respondents seem to use less of the information available on the catalogue record than was anticipated. This finding should be of potential use for the Library in identifying details which can possibly be omitted from the cataloguing process (e.g. illustrations). However, given the possible confusion respondents may have had in distinguishing between the different types of information they used in the same way that cataloguers would, some caution should be exercised before any immediate decisions for exclusion are made. As one author advises, "The final assessment of the value of short entry catalogues must be based on the recognition of the relationship between the cost of including additional bibliographic data (system costs), the frequency with which such data is really needed (user needs), and the influence of the extra data on how quickly and accurately catalogues can be used and on user preference (usability)".[29] As argued throughout this report, user needs should be given priority in any catalogue system design and administrators should direct attention to identifying what these needs are.

Suggestions for additional cataloguing information came primarily from a small minority of postgraduates in the non-science Faculties. The main suggestions were for the information of all Library holdings to be available in every catalogue and for the provision of a theses list in all Library locations.

The results of the question on what areas respondents would like covered on the online catalogue also reinforce the view that staff and students use only a limited number of access points for obtaining

any bibliographic information for their work. 'Subject', 'Title', and 'Area' keywords were identified as the most useful access points. In view of this the Library may consider initially restricting the number of optional access points on the online catalogue to those identified by the study as being the most useful. Additional access points could be made available once a demand had been established. By focusing on a specific range of access points reader services staff can concentrate on developing simple guides for use of the online catalogue which will cater for varying levels of computer sophistication/ familiarity. Of course, the priority at present is to reduce the confusion associated with the current catalogues so that whatever the format, fiche or card, the user can obtain the information desired with the minimum amount of difficulty.

Students in the science strata seem less likely than other students to use Library staff to find out about changes to the catalogues. The proportion of respondents in each target group who used the 'trial and error' method or who didn't find out at all about these changes must clearly be of some concern to Library administrators and a priority for reader services efforts in this area.

Most respondents were satisfied with the information provided on catalogue use. However, this finding may be a bit misleading when viewed in the context of the number of users who have had problems with the catalogues and the clear underutilisation of the fiche. Research assistants were more critical than any other group concerning the information provided on the catalogues.

Students seemed to have more problems than staff locating material (60% vs 45%). A range of problems were indicated, from the book being deliberately hidden or misshelved to inadequate sign-posting. Those postgraduates and academics in the non-science strata seemed to experience more problems finding an item than their counterparts in the sciences. Given that most of the relocation of Library material in the past years has occurred in the social science and humanities areas, this finding is probably of no surprise.

As the Library has discontinued its policy of duplicating material among the different locations, deliberate misshelving will probably increase. The Library should therefore review the adequacy of current shelf checking procedures, particularly in terms of their frequency.

The results show that there is less satisfaction with guiding on the location of material than on the information provided on the catalogues. The main recommendation was for the Library to display better floor plans and signs. Again this is an area which should be treated with high priority by the Library if users are not to be frustrated in accessing material on the shelves.

Library staff are a main source of finding out if a book has been relocated. However, academics in the Research Schools are less likely to use these staff for this information than academics in the Faculties. 'Trial and error' and not finding out about the movement of Library material at all were indicated by a noticeable proportion in each target group. Information sheets seem to be of rather limited success as an information source in this area and probably should be reviewed in terms of content and presentation as well as possible alternatives.

For all target populations, those people who had catalogue problems also tended to experience difficulties finding the Library material they wanted. Expertise in using the Library system does not appear to develop with the length of residence at the University strongly suggesting that the system is at fault rather than the user not having acquired the necessary familiarity. This is further supported by the finding that academics and undergraduates who are frequent users of the catalogues are more likely to experience catalogue problems that those respondents who are less frequent users. Also undergraduates who were frequent catalogue users appeared to have problems finding material on the shelves.

The survey data indicate that the fiche catalogues are probably a major source of difficulty for staff and students and the Library

should therefore examine the types of difficulties experienced and the reasons for underutilisation of fiche in order to better promote their use.

In a system with a logical layout of collections and adequate signposting, the 'trial and error' method of locating material should meet with reasonable success. However, this appears not to the case at the ANU. The location of the collections, while being in great part a result of the change in the historical development of the University rather than of direct intent, is clearly a major limiting factor for users, particularly those in the social science and humanities areas.

With the further changes to the system which will occur with the proposed collection rationalisation in several of the Library's buildings, it is very clear that every effort must be made to provide strong and informed reader services support and adequate guiding if the University's research, teaching and studies functions are not to be frustrated.

On a more fundamental level, however, the survey findings question the adequacy of Library policy and operations in the past in relation to the catalogue. In particular, the survey emphasizes the importance of designing information systems around the needs and searching habits of those who are meant to use them. It is clear that if libraries are to maintain credibility as information providers they must be seen to make use of the extensive body of findings about catalogue use and users and to initiate inquiries where indicated about their own patrons' needs. Finally, as the quality of service provided to the users is the only justification for the academic library's budget allocation, no administrator can afford to maintain policies that reflect a preoccupation with bibliographic control considerations in preference to the type of access wanted by patrons. How this is reconciled, even with the advent of OPACs, will be one of the main challenges for librarians in the '80s.

FOOTNOTES

1. Lipow, A.G. "The catalog in a research library and alternatives to it." in The nature and future of the catalog. Edited by M.J. Freedman & S. Michael Maliconico, Phoenix, Onyx Press, 1979, p242.

2. See, for example, Aubry, J. "A timing study of the manual searching of catalogs." The Library Quarterly, 42, 1972, 399-415. Ayres, F. "Is there a future for cataloguers?" Catalogue and Index, No. 7, 1983, 1-4. Koel, A.I. "Bibliographic control at the crossroads." The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 7, 1981, 220-222.

3. See, Line, M.B. "Ignoring the user." in The nationwide use of information (Aslib/IIS/LA Joint conference), London, The Library Association, 1981, p87. Ayres, op. cit., p.2.

4. See, Thompson, J. "The end of libraries." The Electronic Library, 1, 1983, 247. Beckman, M. "Online catalogs and Library users." Library Journal, 107, 1982, 2044.

5. Perinne, R.H. "Causes and cures: Catalog use difficulties." Research Quarterly, 7, 1968, 169-170.

6. Williamson, N.J. "Is there a catalog in your future? Access to information in the year 2006." Library Resources and Technical Services, 26, 1982, 124.

7. See, for example, American Library Association. Catalog use Study. Edited by V. Mostecky. Chicago, 1958. Aubry, op. cit. Lipetz, B-A. "Catalogue use in a large research library." Library Quarterly, 42, 1972, 129-139. Maltby, A. & Sweeney, R. "The U.K. catalogue use survey." Journal of Librarianship, 4, 1972, 188-204. Perinne, R.H. "Catalog use study." RQ, 6, 1967, 115-119. Saracevic, T. et al. "Causes and dynamics of user frustration in an academic library." College and Research Libraries, 38, 1977, 7-18. Tagliacozzo, R. & Kochen, M. "Information-seeking behaviour of catalog users." Information Storage and Retrieval, 6, 1970, 363-381.

8. Line, op. cit., p.80.

9. Gibb, B. "User survey: the British Columbia union catalogue." Canadian Library Journal, 39, 1982, 83. See also, Grose, M.W. & Line, M.B., "On the construction and care of white elephants." Library Association Record, 70, 1968, 2-5. Koel, op. cit., p.221.

10. Koel, op. cit., pp. 221-222.

11. Lancaster, F.W. The measurement and evaluation of library services. Washington, Information Resources Press, 1977, pp. 19-72.

12. Radford, N. "Failure in the library - a case study." Library Quarterly, 53, 1983, 328-339.

13. Cataloguing Australia, 9, 1983.

14. See, Veaner, A.B. "Technical services research needs for the 1990s. "Library Resources and Technical Services, 27, 1983, 205. Tayyeb, A.B. "Online catalogues: a Canadian overview." Canadian Library Journal, 40, 1983, 5.

15. Brownrigg, E. & Lynch, C. "Online catalogs: Through a glass darkly." Information Technology and Libraries, 2, 1983, 104-105. Ferguson, D. et al. "The CLR public online catalog: an overview." Information Technology and Libraries, 1, 1982, 84-97.

16. Markey, K. "Thus spake the OPAC user." Information Technology and Libraries, 2, 1983, 381-387.

17. Beckman, op. cit., p. 2043

18. Line and Grose, op. cit., p.2.

19. See, Bryant, op. cit., Beckman, op. cit., Kilgour, F.G. "The online catalog revolution." Library Journal, 109, 1984, 319-321.

20. Ayres, op. cit., p.3.

21. Veaner, A.B. "Librarians: the next generation." Library Journal, 109, 1984, 623-625.

22. Australian National University. Report of the Review Committee of the Australian National University Library. Canberra, The Australian National University, 1982, p.v.

23. Lipetz, op. cit.

24. Farber, E.I. "Catalog dependency." Library Journal, 109, 1984, 344.

25. Farber, op. cit., p.328.

26. See for example, Beckmann, op. cit., p. 2044.

27. Maltby & Sweeney, op. cit., p. 195.

28. See, Veaner, op. cit., p. 205; Horny, K. "On-line catalogues." CLJ, 40, 1983, 277-282; Brownrigg, op. cit.

29. Seal, A. et al. Full and short entry catalogues: library needs and use (BLRD Report 5669). Bath University Library: 1982 p.1.

APPENDICES

A1. Derivation of base numbers for calculating standard errors in this survey *

A2. Survey Questionnaire

* This Appendix was compiled by Dr R. Jones, Social Sciences Data Archives, Research School of Social Sciences

A1. DERIVATION OF BASE NUMBERS FOR CALCULATING STANDARD ERRORS IN THIS SURVEY

Dr R. Jones
Social Science Data Archives
Research School of Social Sciences

A sample estimate of the variance of a proportion p estimated from a stratified random sample is given by (Cochran, 1963, 106-107):

$$v(p) = 1/N^2 \sum \frac{N^2_h (N_h - n_h)}{N_h - 1} \frac{p_h(1-p_h)}{n_h - 1}$$

$$= 1/N^2 \sum \frac{N_h (N_h - n_h)}{n_h} p_h(1-p_h) \qquad (A.1)$$

Where N = number of units in the population
N_h = number of units in the hth stratum
n_h = number of units sampled in the hth stratum
p_h = the proportion estimated from the hth stratum

For a proportion p_h estimated from the hth stratum alone, a sample estimate of the variance is given by (Cochran, 1963: 51):

$$v(p_h) = \frac{N_h - n_h}{N_h} \frac{p_h (1 - p_h)}{n_h - 1} \qquad (A.2)$$

Both of these types of estimates occur frequently throughout the report. For example, we are interested in the proportion of academic staff having catalogue problems (Table 13) and also in the proportion of catalogue problems in each of the four staff strata (Table 17). In order to simplify the calculation of standard errors, an approximation is used, based on a comparison between the formulae (A.1) and (A.2) and the standard for p(1-p)/n.

In the case of a proportion p_h estimated from a single stratum alone, consideration (from A.2) of

$$\frac{N_h - n_h}{N_h n_h} p_h(1 - p_h) = \frac{p_h(1 - p_h)}{n}$$

gives $1/n = 1/n_h - 1/N_h$ (A.3)

For a proportion p estimated from all strata, ignoring any variation in $p_h(1 - p_h)$ over strata gives

$$1/n = 1/N^2 \Sigma N_h \frac{(N_h - n_h)}{n_h} \qquad (A.4)$$

(A.3) and (A.4) are used to compute h as appropriate, and the the standard error of a percentage p is given by using this value and the formula

$$\text{standard error} = \sqrt{p(1 - p)n}$$

Table A1 gives the computed values of n for each stratum and the total of each group included in the survey.

TABLE A1: Base of standard error for groups & strata

Groups	Population	Returns	Base of standard error
Academic staff			
IAS Science	390	56	65
IAS Social Science	330	48	61
FACULTY Science	127	33	88
FACULTY Other	230	53	67
TOTAL	987	260	330
Postgraduates			
IAS Science	336	62	89
IAS Social Science	190	62	94
FACULTY Science	226	54	71
FACULTY Other	667	30	61
TOTAL	1919	195	155
Undergraduates			
Arts & Economics	2982	97	94
Asian Studies	238	74	112
Law	643	110	130
Science	1133	98	107
TOTAL	4483	299	214
Research Assistants			
TOTAL	173	64	113

Footnote

Cochran, W.G. 1963 Sampling Techniques, 2nd ed., New York, Wiley.

A2. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

ANU LIBRARY

LIBRARY CATALOGUE SURVEY

CONFIDENTIAL

Office use only

1 ☐☐☐☐

PART A BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please answer all questions

1. Please indicate which one of the following you belong to: 5 ☐☐☐

- ☐ Member of academic staff
- ☐ Research Officer or Research Assistant
- ☐ Full-time postgraduate student
- ☐ Part-time postgraduate student
- ☐ Full-time undergraduate student
- ☐ Part-time undergraduate student
- ☐ Other (please specify)_____

2. With what part of the ANU have you your strongest link: 8 ☐ 9 ☐

- ☐ Faculty of Arts
- ☐ Faculty of Asian Studies
- ☐ Faculty of Economics
- ☐ Faculty of Law
- ☐ Faculty of Science
- ☐ RSBS
- ☐ RSC
- ☐ RSES
- ☐ JCSMR
- ☐ RSPacS
- ☐ RSPhysS
- ☐ RSSS
- ☐ Independent Centres and Units

3. How many years in total have you spent at ANU either as a student or member of staff?

☐☐ years

PART B LIBRARY CATALOGUES

4. How frequently, on average, do you refer to any of the Library's catalogues?

- ☐ Almost daily
- ☐ At least once a week
- ☐ At least once a month
- ☐ I seldom use the catalogues

5. (a) Have you ever had or seen an explanation of how to use any of the Library's catalogues?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, was this explanation by -

- ☐ a member of Library staff
- ☐ a colleague
- ☐ a printed guide or Library information sheet
- ☐ other (please specify) _____

(b) Was this explanation sufficient for you to be able to find the information you wanted?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, why not?

6. (a) Have you ever had any problems in using the Library's catalogues?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, in which Library location(s)?

☐ J.B. Chifley ☐ R.G. Menzies ☐ J.G. Crawford (formerly Life Sciences)

☐ Law ☐ Geology

☐ Earth Sciences ☐ Chemistry (RSChem) ☐ Medical Sciences (JCMMR)

☐ Astronomy ☐ Physical Sciences (RSPhysS) ☐ Library Store (A.D. Hope Building)

(b) What were the problems - (e.g. division between card and microfiche, problems knowing where to look for your reference in the catalogues, etc.)

(c) Did you seek assistance from Library staff?

☐ YES ☐ NO

(d) Was your problem solved satisfactorily?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, why not?

F. In finding the information you need concerning the Library's collections which of the following catalogues do you use? (Please tick as appropriate.)

- ☐ the main card catalogues (i.e. author/title and subject)
- ☐ the Short Loan catalogues
- ☐ East Asian card catalogues
- ☐ United Nations card catalogue
- ☐ on-order slips (filed in card catalogue)
- ☐ Library Store (A.D. Hope Building) serials lists
- ☐ the catalogue cumulation (microfiche)
- ☐ the microfiche supplement
- ☐ the serials microfiche
- ☐ Library orders (microfiche)
- ☐ other (please specify)

_____

G. Apart from information on author, title and call number do you use the catalogues to find any of the following bibliographic information? (Please tick as appropriate.)

Journals	Books	Audiovisual
☐ publisher	☐ publisher	☐ technical details
☐ place of publication	☐ place of publication	☐ duration of cassettes and videocassettes
☐ date of publication	☐ date of publication	☐ summary of content
☐ volumes held	☐ number of copies	☐ other (please specify)
☐ dates held	☐ language	_____
☐ form of material (e.g. film, fiche)	☐ illustrations	_____
☐ other (please specify)	☐ form of material (e.g. film, fiche)	_____
_____	☐ other (please specify)	_____
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

6. (a) Have you ever had any problems in using the Library's catalogues?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, in which Library locations?

☐ J.B. Chifley ☐ R.G. Menzies ☐ J.G. Crawford (formerly Life Sciences)

☐ Law ☐ Geology

☐ Earth Sciences ☐ Chemistry (RSChem) ☐ Medical Sciences (JCSMR)

☐ Astronomy ☐ Physical Sciences (RSPhysS) ☐ Library Store (A.D. Hope Building)

(b) What were the problems - (e.g. division between card and microfiche, problems knowing where to look for your reference in the catalogues, etc.)

(c) Did you seek assistance from Library staff?

☐ YES ☐ NO

(d) Was your problem solved satisfactorily?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, why not?

7. In finding the information you need concerning the Library's collections which of the following catalogues do you use? (Please tick as appropriate.)

- ☐ the main card catalogues (i.e. author/title and subject)
- ☐ the Short Loan catalogues
- ☐ East Asian card catalogues
- ☐ United Nations card catalogue
- ☐ on-order slips (filed in card catalogue)
- ☐ Library Store (A.D. Hope Building) serials lists
- ☐ the catalogue cumulation (microfiche)
- ☐ the microfiche supplement
- ☐ the serials microfiche
- ☐ Library orders (microfiche)
- ☐ other (please specify)

_____

8. Apart from information on author, title and call number do you use the catalogues to find any of the following bibliographic information? (Please tick as appropriate.)

Journals	Books	Audiovisual
☐ publisher	☐ publisher	☐ technical details
☐ place of publication	☐ place of publication	☐ duration of cassettes and videocassettes
☐ date of publication	☐ date of publication	☐ summary of content
☐ volumes held	☐ number of copies	☐ other (please specify)
☐ dates held	☐ language	_____
☐ form of material (e.g. film, fiche)	☐ illustrations	_____
☐ other (please specify)	☐ form of material (e.g. film, fiche)	_____
_____	☐ other (please specify)	_____
_____	_____	
_____	_____	
_____	_____	

9. Is there any other information you would like to see included in the Library's catalogues?

☐ YES ☐ NO [8]

If YES, what information? [8a]

10. At present you can search the Library's catalogues by author, title, series or subject. If it were possible to search by the following kind of information, which ones (if any) would you find the most useful?

☐ country of publication ☐ language [10]

☐ year of publication ☐ location on campus (e.g. in J.B. Chifley Building)

☐ title keywords (i.e. individual words in the title) [11]

☐ subject keywords (i.e. individual words in title or subject headings - these can be searched either singly or in combination)

☐ area keywords (e.g. Pacific, Middle East)

11. How do you currently find out about changes in the catalogues?

☐ refer to printed guide or Library information sheets [12]

☐ ask colleague ☐ ask member of Library staff [13]

☐ I don't ☐ trial and error [14]

☐ other (please specify) [15]

_____ [16]

_____

_____

_____

12. Do you think the Library keeps users satisfactorily informed about how to use the catalogues effectively?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, what improvements would you suggest?

PART C FINDING LIBRARY MATERIALS

13. Have you had difficulties finding the books you wanted on the shelves once you have found the call number from the catalogue?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If YES, what was the problem?

14. Do you think the Library provides sufficient signs to guide users to the physical whereabouts of Library materials?

☐ YES ☐ NO

If NO, what improvements would you suggest?

15. How do you find out if material has been moved to another Library location (e.g. from Menzies to Crawford)

- ☐ refer to printed guide or Library information sheets
- ☐ ask member of Library staff
- ☐ ask colleague
- ☐ trial and error
- ☐ I don't
- ☐ other (please specify)

_____

_____

_____

What other comments would you like to make about the catalogues or finding the Library material you need?

July 1983.